Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/556,653	NEWELL ROGERS	S ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEPHEN KAPUSHOC	1634	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>STEPHEN KAPUSHOC</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Hele Lockhart</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 20 September 2010	Time: <u>9:30am</u>		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 8 and 9			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>			
/Stephen Kapushoc/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if ap	propriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' election relevant to claim 1 as an Election of part (a) of claim 1 (assessing mitochondrial deletion) was discussed. It was noted that the election of part (a) of claim 1 is not consonant with the subject matter of claims 8 and 9, where claims 8 and 9 require analysis of membrane potential, and membrane potential is relevant to the non-elected part (b) of claim 1. It was agreed that applicants maintain the election of part (a) of claim 1, and claims 8 and 9 are withdrawn from examination as to non-elected subject matter. It was further discussed that claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 2, where claim 2 is cancelled.